

1 BRIAN STRETCH (CABN 132612)  
2 Acting United States Attorney

3 DAVID R. CALLAWAY (CABN 121782)  
4 Chief, Criminal Division

5 KATHRYN HAUN (DCBN 484131)  
6 WILLIAM FRENTZEN (LABN 24421)  
7 Assistant United States Attorneys

8 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
9 San Francisco, California 94102-3495  
10 Telephone: (415) 436-7200  
11 FAX: (415) 436-7234  
12 Kathryn.haun@usdoj.gov  
13 William.frentzen@usdoj.gov

14 RAYMOND N. HULSER (MABN 551350)  
15 Chief, Public Integrity Section

16 RICHARD B. EVANS (DCBN 441494)  
17 Trial Attorney

18 1400 New York Avenue, N.W.  
19 Washington, D.C. 20005  
20 Telephone: (202) 353-7760  
21 Richard.B.Evans@usdoj.gov

22 Attorneys for United States of America

23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
24 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
25 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

26 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ) NO. CR 15-CR 319-001 RS  
27 v. )  
28 SHAUN W. BRIDGES ) UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO  
29 (A/K/A "NUMBER 13"), ) DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR EARLY  
30 Defendant. ) TERMINATION OF ELECTRONIC MONITORING  
31 )  
32 )  
33 )  
34 )  
35 )

36  
37 The United States, through its undersigned attorneys, hereby opposes the motion filed by  
38 defendant Shaun W. Bridges for early termination of electronic monitoring.

1       On January 25, 2016, Defendant filed his motion seeking early termination of the court-ordered  
2 electronic monitoring on the eve of his reporting deadline to the Federal Correctional Institution, Berlin,  
3 New Hampshire (FCI Berlin) as directed by the Bureau of Prisons (BOP). Dkt. No. 111. Said motion is  
4 predicated upon the fact that Bridges has been ordered by the BOP to report to FCI Berlin by noon on  
5 Friday, January 29, 2016, and that wearing the electronic monitor would complicate his travel to the  
6 facility and that it could not be completed in a single day. This is simply not the case. Moreover, the  
7 reasons for the electronic monitoring are not diminished<sup>1</sup> because Bridges is now on the eve of serving  
8 his 71-month sentence.

9       Bridges claims that transportation by car from his home in Maryland to FCI Berlin would take  
10 approximately 10 hours and that, as such, he could not make the trip in a single day. However, nothing  
11 would prevent Bridges from leaving Maryland in the early morning hours of January 29 which would  
12 allow him to arrive at FCI Berlin by noon. Moreover, Bridges could always travel to FCI Berlin the day  
13 before and report in late on the afternoon/evening of January 28.

14       Defendant Bridges also claims that wearing the electronic monitoring bracelet at the time he  
15 reports to prison to begin serving his sentence could complicate the process as the prison personnel may  
16 not be familiar with the bracelet and how to remove it. That is also not the case. Indeed, the  
17 undersigned counsel has learned from Warden Esker Tatum at FCI Berlin that the personnel at FCI  
18 Berlin are familiar with and can assist with the removal of the electronic monitoring bracelet when  
19 Bridges reports to the facility.

20       Finally, there is more reason than ever for the United States to be concerned about Bridges'  
21 possible flight prior to his report date on January 29, 2016. As the Court will recall, the United States  
22 sought to have Bridges remanded into custody both at his plea hearing and again at his sentencing given  
23 repeated conduct by Bridges, which indicated that he was a flight risk. Such conduct included repeated  
24 attempts to change his name and social security number and to have such information shielded from law  
25 enforcement. This and other conduct by Bridges led the Court to seriously consider the government's  
26

27       

---

<sup>1</sup> The government sought Bridges' remand to custody and for the reasons adduced at the  
28 sentencing and change of plea hearing, the government continues to believe that the defendant should be  
remanded instead of voluntarily surrendering.

1 request to remand Bridges into custody; however, the court ultimately declined to do so, instead, placing  
2 further restrictive release conditions upon Bridges. Since that time Bridges has also filed a motion for  
3 the return of his passport – a motion that was denied by the Court. Dkt. No. 107. The concerns which  
4 led the government to seek Bridges’ remand are still present and are even more acute today given that  
5 his report date is imminent and that Bridges’ movements would be unmonitored for two days prior to his  
6 reporting deadline at FCI Berlin should the court grant Bridges’ motion. Now is simply not the time to  
7 remove Bridges’ electronic monitoring.

8 For the reasons stated above, the United States respectfully requests that the Court deny the  
9 subject motion.

10  
11 DATED: January 26, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

12  
13 BRIAN J. STRETCH  
Acting United States Attorney

14  
15 /s/  
16 KATHRYN HAUN  
WILLIAM FRENTZEN  
Assistant United States Attorneys

17 RICHARD B. EVANS  
Public Integrity Section

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28